

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University, San Marcos

June 2015

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at California State University, San Marcos. The report of the team presents findings based upon a thorough review of the Institutional Self-Study reports, supporting documentation, and interviews with representative constituencies. Based upon the findings of the team, an accreditation recommendation is made for this institution of **Accreditation**.

Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions For all Programs offered by the Institution

	Initial	Advanced
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Met	Met
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Met	Met
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Met	Met
4) Diversity	Met	Met
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Met	Met
6) Unit Governance and Resources	Met	Met
CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process	Met	
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	Met	

Program Standards

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject	19	19		
Single Subject	19	19		
Education Specialist: MM, with Internship	22	22		
Education Specialist: MS, with Internship	24	24		
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder	3	3		
Bilingual Authorization	6	6		
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	5	5		
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential	5	5		

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)	10	10		
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	15		
Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential – Speech- Language Pathology	8	8		

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: California State University, San Marcos

Dates of Visit: April 12, 2015 – April 14, 2015

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

NCATE/Common Standards

The decision of the entire team regarding the six NCATE standards is that all standards are **Met**. The decision of the team regarding the parts of California's two Common Standards that are required of NCATE accredited institutions is that both standards are **Met**.

Program Standards –

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for California State University, San Marcos. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) team found that all standards are **Met** in all programs.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documents, program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, master teachers, candidates, completers, and Advisory Board members. Based on the fact that all Common Standards are **Met** and that all program standards are **Met** the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject

Preliminary Multiple Subject

Single Subject

Preliminary Single Subject

Education Specialist Credentials

Preliminary

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Internship

Advanced/Service Credentials

Preliminary Administrative Services

Other Services Credentials

Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential –

Speech Language Pathology

Added Authorization:

Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD)

Bilingual Authorization

California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)

Reading Language Specialist Credential

Reading Certificate

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California State University, San Marcos be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, San Marcos continues in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

California Co-Chair:

Edmundo Litton

Loyola Marymount University

NCATE Co-Chair:

Maureen Gillette

Northeastern Illinois University

**NCATE/Common Standards
Cluster:**

Amy Robbins

Cal Poly San Luis Obispo

Caron Mellblom-Nishioka

CSU Dominguez Hills

Cheryl Shintani

University of Hawaii

Willis Walter, Jr.

Cookman

Teaching Programs Cluster:

Candace Poindexter

Loyola Marymount University

Kaydee Caywood

National University

Services Programs Cluster:

Marv Abrams

Brandman University

Sue Yockelson

Brandman University

Staff to the Visit:

Katie Croy –Consultant

Sarah Solari-Colombini –Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog

Common Standards Report

Course Syllabi

Candidate Files

Fieldwork Handbooks

Follow-up Survey Results

Needs Analysis Results

Program Assessment Feedback

Biennial Report Feedback

Field Experience Notebooks

Schedule of Classes

Advisement Documents

Faculty Vitae

College Annual Report

College Budget Plan

TPA

Data

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	Common Standards	Program Sampling	TOTAL
Candidates		165	165
Completers	5	24	29
Interns	1	1	2
Employers	7	2	9
Institutional Administration	4	1	5
Program Coordinators		14	14
Faculty	20	26	46
Adjunct Faculty	16	15	31
CalTPA Coordinator	1	3	4
Advisors	3	2	5
Field Supervisors – Program	4	20	24
Field Supervisors - District	5	10	15
Credential Analysts and Staff	6	2	8
Advisory Board Members	42	10	52
Other		6	6
TOTAL	114	301	415

Note: In some cases, individuals may have been interviewed more than once (e.g., faculty) if they serve in multiple roles.

The Visit

The California State University, San Marcos site visit was held on the campus in San Marcos, California from April 12-14, 2015. This was a joint National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)/Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) accreditation visit, utilizing the Continuous Improvement model for NCATE. The site visit team consisted of two co-chairs, one working with the NCATE team and one working with the CTC team, two California Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) members who served on the NCATE team reviewing the NCATE Unit Standards (Common Standards) and, because of the size and number of programs and pathways, four Program Standards members. Two Commission consultants accompanied the visit. The NCATE and CTC teams met jointly on Sunday, April 12, 2015 at 12:00pm. The NCATE and CTC chairs began with introductions, reviewed the interview schedule, and discussed initial findings. The team travelled to the university to participate in interviews with constituents and to participate in a gallery walk/poster session. Interviews continued throughout Monday, April 13, 2015. A mid-visit report was completed Monday afternoon. On Monday evening, the full team met to discuss findings and make decisions on standards. The exit report was conducted at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 14, 2015.

CSU San Marcos Candidate and Completer totals

Programs	Completers (2013-14)	Candidates (2013-14)
Preliminary Multiple Subject	143	187
Preliminary Single Subject	38	44
Education Specialist MM w/ intern	36	48
Education Specialist MS w/ intern	10	2
Added Authorization in Special Education- Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD)	0	0
Bilingual Authorization	25	39
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)	8	11
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	16
Clinical Rehabilitative Services – Speech Language Pathology	26	27
Reading Language Arts Specialist	0	0
Reading Certificate	0	0

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit

California State University San Marcos (CSUSM), located in North San Diego County, is a designated Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander-serving institution that enrolls over 12,000 students in bachelor's and master's degree programs. Known for its student diversity and classified by Carnegie as a "community engaged" university, CSUSM's vision and mission statement speak to a commitment to the diversity of the region it serves through the delivery of strong, student-centered programs that have a "positive impact on the social, economic, and cultural fabric of the community." Institutional values include: Intellectual Engagement, Community, Integrity, Innovation, and Inclusiveness. CSUSM has four Colleges: the College of Education, Health, and Human Services; the College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences; the College of Science and Mathematics; and the College of Business Administration.

The College of Education, Health, and Human Services (CEHHS) houses the professional educator preparation programs in its School of Education (SOE). CEHHS is headed by the dean, and the SOE is led by a director. The SOE offers initial programs in Multiple Subjects, Single Subject, and Education Specialist (Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe). With one exception (the Integrated Curriculum Pathway, a partnership with liberal studies program) all initial programs begin at the post-baccalaureate level. Several programs include a master's option. The SOE offers four advanced programs for teachers which lead to a credential: Autism Spectrum Disorders; Bilingual Authorization (Spanish); California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL); Education Specialist (Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe). The Master of Arts in Education

(General Option) is an advanced program that does not lead to a credential. The SOE also has two advanced programs for other school professionals, one in Educational Administration and one in Speech Language Pathology. The unit also has a joint doctoral program with the University of California San Diego. Because the degree is granted by UCSD, this program was not part of the current review.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

The state partnership provides for a joint visit. A team from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) worked alongside the Board of Examiners (BOE) team to complete program-level reviews. Two of the five BOE team members were state team members. The CTC (state) team chair coordinated all activities with the chair of the BOE team, both before and during the onsite visit. There were no deviations from the state protocol for the visit.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

The unit does not offer programs at branch campuses or via distance learning. Some courses are offered off-site at a local elementary school, but a candidate does not complete an entire program at these sites. The team examined the contract between the school district and the SOE for the delivery of these courses and the sites were a part of the on-site visit. The team also interviewed superintendents and principals from the district and schools where candidates take courses. Visits to the school site and interviews with candidates, teachers, and administrators confirmed that the resources (i.e., technology, curriculum materials) provided in the school sites are sufficient to deliver quality courses. Additionally, the classes at the school partner site enhance the education of candidates as well as the relationship between faculty and administration in the unit and their P-12 partners. Finally, the school sites used are close enough to allow access to the CSUSM campus when necessary.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

There were no unusual circumstances during the visit.

II. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The mission, vision, and values of the School of Education mirror those of the university. The unit is underpinned by a strong conceptual framework conceptual framework that is summarized as “engaging diverse communities through learning and leading for social justice.” A commitment to diversity and social justice is visible in the governance structure, the curriculum and field experiences, the candidate population and the faculty. Faculty research, teaching, and service activities are prioritized around the theme. Through the governance structures, faculty have reviewed and reaffirmed the conceptual framework over the past few years. No major changes have been made to the conceptual framework but there has instead been a renewed focus on and commitment to community engagement and social justice. The tenets of the conceptual framework are as follows: Student –Centered Education, Research and Theory Inform Practice, Applied Practice (linking course work to the field), Strong Faculty-Candidate Engagement; Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, Co-Teaching, Instructional Alignment (CA Teaching Performance Expectations), Standard Candidate Proficiencies (CA).

NCATE STANDARDS/CTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Overall findings

1.1 What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The Institutional Report (IR) and the IR addendum provided documentation and careful consideration of and attention to candidate learning and development as professional educators. Concurrent California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, (CTC) review indicated that all state standards have been met. The team interviewed full-time and adjunct faculty, staff and students from the 14 credential, education specialist and Master’s degree programs in order to validate these findings. Learning outcomes, syllabi, program dispositions and student work samples were reviewed for the initial and advanced programs and revealed strong evidence of intent to provide learning experiences designed to develop education professionals who implement leading educational practices based on current pedagogy and professional knowledge. Additionally, all initial teacher candidates must take three prerequisite courses prior to beginning preliminary teacher preparation coursework. With the exception of the MA general option, advanced candidates must possess a valid preliminary credential. All advanced candidates are subject to a rigorous admission process, which includes interviews, professional references, and writing samples.

Clear pathways for program completion are evident and the course sequence is equally clear. A review of the exhibits revealed documents related to program sequence, candidate dispositions

and expectations. Content knowledge represents adherence to the standards for teacher preparation that are mandated by the CCTC and represent best practice in the field of education.

Candidates have the opportunity to learn in cohorts that often meet off campus at school and clinical sites where they engage in field experiences that allow them to implement pedagogy and strategies that they are learning in their courses. Through innovative concurrent course sequencing students can graduate with two or three credentials in five semesters of powerful learning experiences.

A cross section of work products from the beginning, middle and final aspects of the initial and advanced programs were reviewed. These provided evidence of the scope and sequence of content and pedagogy in which the candidates are engaged. The School of Education has adopted the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, CalTPA to assess candidate knowledge skills and dispositions at multiple points through the program sequences. Data indicated that initial candidates pass TPA tasks with 98% accuracy. The team validates claims that “candidates plan, instruct, adjust instruction, and monitor activities for P-12 student learning. Initial and advanced candidates submit lesson plans, digital portfolios, case studies, and social justice action plans that support student learning.

Teacher Candidates demonstrated evidence of differentiated instructional pedagogies for the learners in their assigned classrooms. They spoke of the need to engage students in learner centered strategies and indicated a connection between the content pedagogy in their coursework and implementation in the classrooms to which they were assigned for clinical practice. At the school site visits, team members saw candidates engaged in multiple teaching and learning environments designed to support the diverse learning needs of their students. Program graduates assume leadership roles in their schools and continue to support the CSUSM mission. Alumni are often tapped to serve as onsite liaisons providing additional support to candidates in their clinical placements. They are also part of the continuous improvement feedback loop as a connection between the school sites and the unit.

Students interviewed discussed the extent to which they are engaged in deliberate collaborations with students in their cohorts, and their cooperating teachers during their field experiences and clinical practice. Teacher candidates and cooperating teachers work together to plan and implement student centered engaging lessons. Evidence of this was observed during onsite school visits.

Community partnerships have been established and are evident in the North County Professional Development Federation. Team members heard repeatedly that school district administration seeks CSUSM graduates to fill positions in their schools. This is due to the strengths of the knowledge, pedagogical skills technology integration and positive dispositions of the CSUSM candidates. Cooperating teachers spoke of reciprocal learning that occurred whenever they had a student teacher in their classrooms.

Faculty spoke of co-teaching often with faculty across disciplines and programs as well as within their departments. Adjunct faculty indicated that they felt supported and that they collaborated with the permanent faculty in the programs. Common course syllabi were provided to adjunct faculty and training was conducted regularly. Clinical supervisors also indicated that they received training and that they met each semester to review program rubrics and changes to protocols for evaluations.

Program and department meetings are scheduled biweekly with some programs choosing to meet weekly to review student progress toward their goals and other issues related to program development and improvement. Faculty also indicated that they use Box or similar systems to house common syllabi, meeting notes and other useful documents to ensure candidate monitoring and success. Candidates indicated that they are regularly engaged in reflective feedback and that their portfolios are reviewed and included in program change decisions.

The CSUSM provides ample access to technology for candidates. The campus library and the SOE offer lending services for technology, materials and supplies that the candidates use in their work with students in their clinical practice.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

n/a

1.2b What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The IR states “The School of Education mission and vision statement acknowledges “engagement with community, regional, and global partners to prepare highly skilled and ethical educators. Its vision is to be committed to transformation, ethical behavior, diversity, and innovation through teaching, service, and scholarship focused on our region, state, and the global community.” The team saw evidence of this during the visit and it was verified through the interviews with students, alumni, faculty and staff.

The assessment system has been fully implemented to provide candidate work samples faculty review student work products and archived program data are used regularly to inform program improvement and change. Students articulate an awareness of the feedback loop and self-reflection as a means of developing professional expertise. Cooperating teachers speak of the benefits that they yield from having a student teacher in their classrooms.

Faculty spoke of using program data to inform program improvement. On multiple occasions faculty explained how a systematic review of student work demonstrated the need for increased attention to particular aspects of the content or pedagogy. Additionally they noted that review of archived data informed decisions to change when data was collected or concepts were introduced.

The SOE demonstrates its commitment to community involvement through their continued support of the North County Professional Development Federation. This agency is co-sponsored by the SOE and provides a network for collaboration among the school districts and the CSUSM SOE.

1.2bi What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The commitment to and the connection between pedagogy and practice is evident in the SOE sponsored distinguished teacher in residency (DTiR) programs at local schools. The DTiR works with the candidates during their Clinical practice experiences and provides an additional layer of expert mentoring for the developing teacher candidate. They also serve to emulate the highly skilled and ethical teaching practice that is embedded in the mission of the unit.

1.3 What AFIs have been removed?

The previous visiting team found one AFI for standard one. "The unit does not have sufficient and uniform assessment processes to analyze and summarize data to demonstrate student knowledge, skills and dispositions, excluding Educational Administration and Special Education, Level II." Since then the unit has developed a clear and comprehensive assessment process. An assessment coordinator position has been institutionalized. The unit submits biennial reports to the state and includes data from key assessments. The Taskstream data management system has been implemented to archive student work products, signature assignments and data related to Student Learning Outcomes, (SLO's). These data are reviewed regularly and are used to inform program change and improvement. This was clearly described in the Institutional Report and validated through exhibits that were reviewed prior to the visit and interviews conducted onsite. Evidence of ongoing analysis of the data collected has been demonstrated. Both fulltime and adjunct faculty indicated regular review of data sets such as student work samples, self-reflections and course projects to inform program change and improvement. This AFI has been removed.

What AFIs are continued from last visit?

none

What new AFIs are recommended?

none

Recommendations

none

Standard 1-	Initial Programs	Met
	Advanced programs	Met

California Team Decision **Met**

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

After reviewing the IR, IR addendum and conducting onsite interviews, the team has found standard 2 to be met.

The unit implements a unit assessment system aligned with the SOE conceptual framework. Interviews across constituencies at initial and advanced levels affirmed the unit's emphasis of social justice and meeting the needs of all learners.

Assessment for initial credential programs is based on the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) while advanced programs, added authorizations, and certificate programs have an assessment system based on state standards for each specific area of study. The M.A. advanced degrees have an assessment system based on the university's Degree Program Review Policies and Guidelines as well as program student learning outcomes. All programs receive input and feedback from the professional community via their advisory board. The current SOE advisory board is a recently developed subset of the North County Professional Development Federation (NCPDF). While NCPDF provides a unique opportunity for professional collaboration across invested education partners, the purpose of this committee is not specifically to provide feedback, input and advice to the SOE and its programs. The SOE will benefit from utilizing their recently developed advisory board by creating agenda items that regularly and systematically address their own issues and needs.

Within all initial and advanced programs, data are collected at multiple transition points. Some examples of credential program assessments are CalTPA results, Statements of Concern, one-year out survey data and state mandated assessment scores (e.g., CBEST, CSET, RICA). Non-credential advanced programs utilize assessments such as a disposition rubric, the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement, and a culminating experience such as a dissertation or project. The College of Education, Health and Human Services (CEHHS) employs an Assessment Coordinator who supports SOE data collection and dissemination at both the initial and advanced levels. Additionally, the SOE employs a TPA Coordinator who analyzes TPA data for the multiple and single subject programs. In this role, the TPA Coordinator collaborates with program coordinators to develop Action Plans based on TPA results. Some specific outcomes of these action plans have been adoption of a new text to better address meeting the needs of all students and adjustment of time within classes to spend more time on specific areas such as 'making adaptations'.

SOE faculty and staff meet regularly in different capacities. Meetings noted within the Institutional Report and confirmed during interviews include coordinators meetings, program

meetings and SOE community meetings. Faculty from both initial and advanced programs confirm that decision making and sharing of programmatic data occur at these meetings. Some specific examples of this are the discussion about transitioning from CalTPA to edTPA and program coordinators indicating they share their own data and hear about data from other programs during coordinator meetings.

All credential, authorization and certificate programs at the initial and advanced levels are accountable to the state's Program Assessment Cycle. This continuous improvement cycle includes data-driven biennial reports and comprehensive program assessment documents to ensure state-mandated standards are being addressed. Within biennial reports, a specific section is devoted to how programmatic findings relate to the larger unit. With the exception of the General Option, all M.A. programs are also accountable to this system. All MAs, including the General Option, are accountable to the University Program Review process.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

2.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Since the 2007 review, there is evidence that unit has been engaged in continuous improvement. Some examples supporting this are the hiring of an Assessment Coordinator for the purpose of data management and tracking, Response to Intervention concepts have been added to all credential programs, the Statement of Concern has become a data-source shared across all programs, CalTPA was adopted and implemented within initial credential programs, Taskstream is being utilized for data management purposes and advanced M.A. programs now have Program Student Learning Outcomes.

Interviews with students and members of the local education community indicate their feedback has prompted change within the program. Two specific examples of this is the addition of more information on how to manage and work with instructional aides and other support personnel within the education specialist program and a restructuring of coursework and fieldwork to provide single subject candidates an opportunity to be out in schools from the beginning to the end of the academic year. At the unit level, there was a need for more administrative support within the SOE so the CEHHS supported the hiring of an administrative support coordinator specifically assigned to SOE. An example of a data driven change at the advanced level is the new structure of the MA General Option program. MA students within this program previously had a wide variety of courses to choose from when pursuing their MA. This resulted in courses with low enrollments or even canceled courses, which impacted student completion and faculty workloads. To solve this issue, the MA program has now developed three tracks so students still have options of which track to select but once a track has been selected, enrollment numbers should remain more stable and recruitment for these tracks is now possible in a more systematized way.

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

2.3.a What AFIs are recommended for removal?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
AFI 1: Technology is not used consistently by programs to collect, aggregate, and analyze program assessment data.	ITP, ADV	Taskstream and File Maker Pro are both being utilized by the assessment coordinator to collect, aggregate and analyze assessment data.
AFI 2: The unit does not summarize candidate performance data in a systematic way useful for program improvement and unit management purposes.	ITP, ADV	Data from assessments such as CalTPA, TPE assessments, online portfolios, and university program reviews are summarized in a way useful for program improvement and unit management.
AFI 3: The absence of clearly articulated learning outcomes precludes assessment of candidates' performance in the non-credential based advanced programs (i.e., Master's Program)	ADV	Learning outcomes have now been articulated for the Ed.D. and M.A. programs and assessments plans have been developed to address the learning outcomes.

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
None		

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

Standard 2- Initial Programs **Met**
Advanced programs **Met**

California Team Decision **Met**

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The evidence presented in the unit's Institutional Report, observations by the onsite team, unit faculty interviews, school-based teacher interviews and candidate interviews provide evidence

that the unit works with the school partners and other members of the professional community to design, implement, and assess field experiences and clinical practice. The unit delivers and evaluates field experiences and clinical practice to help candidates develop their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions as validated by supervising teachers, faculty and candidates. The unit works with P-12 district advisory groups to determine the specific placement of full-time and part-time student interns and other professional roles to provide appropriate learning experiences. The School of Education (SOE) shares a unique relationship with the North County Professional Development Federation (NCPDF) that assures strong communication from the surrounding school districts.

Faculty in initial and advanced programs make decisions about field experiences and clinical practice along with P-12 school partners as validated by P-12 administrators and teacher candidates. The SOE has clinical practice agreements with more than 35 school districts as verified by review of documents and confirmed through interviews with P-12 administrators and program advisory board members. Candidates observe and participate at highly diverse school settings as determined by the school profiles and corroborated by supervising teacher interviews. Field placement coordinators (FPC) and program coordinators (PC) monitor policy compliance, also validated by school personnel and candidate interviews. FPCs over the last four years have been able to provide Summer Clinics, K-16 STEM Initiatives, Common Core Focus Groups, and changes to technology using data shared by the surrounding school districts and the NCPDF. Training sessions are provided for cooperating teachers (CT), however middle-level supervising teachers describe a need for additional training for new teachers and annual updates for continuing professionals. Courses being taught at several of the P-12 partnering schools allow innovative ways for the SOE to get practical experience for candidates and provide an early relationship with district-wide personnel. The Tutor Connection: A Community-Based Partnership for English Language Learning provides candidates with diverse experiences.

Interviews confirmed that initial and advanced programs include diverse placements. Initial and advanced programs have coherent components that prepare candidates to meet learning outcomes associated with field clinical assignments. Prior to admission to a credentialed program, candidates take three prerequisite courses. One of these courses requires 45 hours of observation and interaction in P- 12 settings. In the Multiple Subject (elementary and middle) and Single Subject (secondary) programs, candidates observe and participate in two or more grade levels, or subject specific teaching, before beginning their clinical practice. During the two semesters of Clinical Practice (CP), candidates observe and participate in two or more P-12 public school classrooms at two different sites, including hard-to-staff or under performing schools as validated through interviews with current candidates and recent graduates of the program. All candidates are placed in schools where they can teach English language learners and all initial program candidates are placed in co-teaching settings with a CT who has been trained in this model. Candidates receive information regarding their program's field experiences through the CP handbook. However, middle-level candidates described a need for additional information outlining field placements. Interviews confirmed university supervisors observe candidates a minimum of four times and complete a summative evaluation at the end of each semester. According to interviews initial and advanced program candidates change

clinical sites to experience different schools and grade levels. Many of the programs hold coursework on school sites for the first eight weeks of each of the two semesters. Candidates participate in tutoring, observation, and mini-teaching experiences as part of their on-site coursework. For the second eight weeks of each semester, candidates are placed at various sites for full-time CP I or CP II. In all initial two-semester programs, candidates start CP at the beginning of the P-12 school semester. Supervising teachers and candidates discussed assisting teachers with a variety of classes, such as the AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) program, and special education instruction.

All candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practices that include students with diverse learning needs, which offers candidates the opportunity to demonstrate differentiation of instruction. Both field experiences and clinical practices allow time for reflection. These reflect feedback from clinical faculty and cooperating teachers or teacher supervisors, which help teacher candidates develop strategies for improving student learning. Student work samples were provided demonstrating candidate reflection on how to help students who are reading below grade level and students with diverse needs, goals and backgrounds. Using TPE data the ES faculty decided to partner with the Speech Language Pathology (SLP) faculty to model co-teaching and rewrote course standards in EDM 627 to better meet the needs of the candidates. Diversity of field experience sites for clinical practice and field observations were confirmed by both Middle-Level and General Option programs candidates. Samples of evaluations that demonstrate areas of diversity and differentiation were provided. Lesson plan rubrics are provided to show the evaluation process.

Collaboration exists between the unit and school partners through the development of councils and committees that work toward implementation of programs that benefit the San Marcos region. The unit has designed and implemented a process that evaluates both field experience and clinical practice through criteria that correlates with state teaching requirements. School visits and interviews confirmed that all candidates are required to use technology to support teaching, learning, and professional growth. In EDUC 422, candidates are introduced to technology applications for information management, instructional activities, assessment, and student learning. Some initial programs participate in the university's iPad initiative where teacher candidates check out iPads to use during CP and throughout the program. However, advanced candidates can select or opt out of technology courses leading to inconsistent technology experiences. Candidates use Smart Boards and computer labs and incorporate students' personal devices in their teaching. Advanced candidates in Education Specialist and Bilingual Authorization (BLA) programs work within their home school sites to develop action research projects, which include real-world applications to field experiences and clinical practice that benefit their home school. Advanced candidates have a school-based mentor and program faculty supervisor who provide feedback and guidance throughout the field work as described by candidates. Criteria for school faculty, including CTs are clearly delineated and distributed by FPCs to district and school site personnel. Selected as accomplished professionals by the school site, CTs receive training in co-teaching and mentoring and are supported by the university supervisors throughout the semester. University supervisors attend training for school faculty, including meetings designed for supervision specific duties. Multiple

assessments for clinical practice are used at critical stages throughout the program. Assessments pertaining to initial and advanced programs are outlined in the field experiences assessments as described by supervising teachers and candidates. Candidates confirmed that they are provided verbal and written feedback by university supervisors and CTs as part of ongoing formative assessments. Candidates confirmed, P-12 school partners and coursework instructors provide feedback regarding professional dispositions. However, many of the multiple subject candidates for multi-levels described a minor need for a stronger connection between the many required state test and some of the program courses. Supervising teachers confirm that ongoing assessments occur as a part of the advanced program course assignments and field work. Initial program candidates made reference that field clinical support was provided through the CP handbook. Candidates described multiple examples of other candidates benefiting directly from the cooperating teacher's daily modeling.

At the end of each semester, the initial program supervisor prepares a summative evaluation. Advanced candidate data varied by program, but demonstrated field clinical requirements based on rubrics and evaluation processes as documented in the biennial reports. Candidates confirmed that the ASD (ES) program placements and procedures are identical to initial programs, which include placement at candidate selected school sites, evaluation by trained university supervisors that assure completion of TPE and summative assessments. According to interviews BLA candidates follow clinical expectations as outlined for all initial programs with the inclusion of an observation completed in a Spanish-English bilingual setting.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

3.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Through interviews several significant changes were confirmed as demonstrating engagement in continuous improvement: (a) co-teaching (initial), (b) assessment of professional dispositions (initial and advanced), and the (c) ongoing collaboration-based changes (initial and advanced).

Candidates change clinical sites to experience different schools and grade levels. They observe in a variety of classrooms, tutor individual students, attend open houses at the beginning of the year, and participate in faculty meeting and professional development activities (Exhibits 3.4.e.3-5; 3.4.e.8; 3.4.g.1-2).

All candidates are required to use technology to support teaching, learning, and professional growth. In EDUC 422 (Exhibit I.5.b), candidates are introduced to technology applications for information management, instructional activities, assessment, and student learning. Programs participate in the university's iPad initiative where TCs check out iPads to use during CP and throughout the program. Candidates use Smart Boards and computer labs and incorporate students' personal devices in their teaching. Advanced candidates in EDAD, ES, and BLA programs work within their home school sites to develop action research projects, which include real-world applications to field experiences and clinical practice that benefit their home school. Advanced candidates have a school-based mentor and program faculty supervisor who provide feedback and guidance throughout the field work (Exhibit 3.4.e.1-3).

All initial and advanced programs review key assessment data on an annual basis through the biennial reporting process and implement program changes, including clinical practice. Faculty in the bilingual authorization program (advanced) developed a Task Stream site to collect student clinical work electronically and track program completion.

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

3.3.a What AFIs are recommended for removal?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. The unit does not arrange placement for field experiences for part-time candidates.	ITP	Through interviews with K-12 administrators, supervising teachers and part-time candidates evidence has been shared, demonstrating that the unit arranges field experience placements for part-time candidates.

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. None	ITP	

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None

Rationale: None

California Decision: Met

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

Overall Findings

Learning outcomes, course syllabi, dispositions and development of unique diversity-related TPEs provide evidence that the unit promotes candidates' development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity at both the initial and advanced levels. The Conceptual Framework reflects this commitment to diversity and program structures provide

opportunities for candidates to apply this knowledge within schools. In interviews with faculty, recent graduates, current candidates and the advisory committee, the theme of social justice was noted multiple times. At the institution level CSUSM hired a consulting firm to look at diversity issues across the campus. Although the data was not disaggregated specifically for SOE, one finding of this effort was that CEHHS had the highest number of diversity-related graduate courses (59%).

TPE assessments at initial levels and advanced program signature assessment rubrics provide a means to evaluate candidate effectiveness related to diversity objectives. Through the CalTPA and disposition assessments, faculty review and provide feedback on candidates' abilities to work with all students. During interviews candidates noted the unit's emphasis on cultural sensitivity and meeting the needs of all learners. Recent graduates shared that during employment interviews they felt it was critical that the schools where they ultimately were hired shared their visions of equity, social justice and a commitment to serving all student within the least restrictive environment. At the institution level, a diversity mapping project has occurred and specific recommendations for addressing those recommendations across campus, including within the curriculum, will be forthcoming.

Interviews with faculty and administrators confirmed that the unit continues to hire diverse faculty. Initial and advanced candidates have multiple opportunities to benefit from a range of cultural backgrounds and experiences among diverse tenured and adjunct faculty, faculty in other units, and school community faculty to address teaching and learning from multiple perspectives and different life experiences. Interviews with the vice president for diversity, the dean, and faculty members confirm that the unit recruits and hires faculty from diverse populations who are knowledgeable about and sensitive to preparing candidates to work with diverse students, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Observations in the schools, assessments on diversity, and interviews with current candidates, graduates, faculty, and school personnel verify experiences of candidates with diverse faculty. Members of all interview groups noted that the unit faculty members and P-12 schools faculty share the values of diversity, social justice, and equity.

Faculty members have been trained in diversity issues and have developed criteria for ensuring that diversity, social justice, and equity are integrated into their coursework and assessments. An examination of several Mission-to-Action plans proposed, funded, and implemented by unit faculty members contain explicit emphases on diversity. Collaboration among all stakeholders, including P-12 partners, provides an interdisciplinary structure whereby community members learn from each other and to evolve as a change agents and lifelong learners.

Initial candidates have the opportunity to work with diverse peers. In 2012-13, candidate demographics in the unit were well-aligned with the demographics of the geographical area serviced by the university. At the initial level, twenty-one percent of the candidates are Latino, two percent are Native American, four percent are Black or African American and Asian (each), and sixty-four percent are White. At the advanced level, sixteen percent of the candidates are Latino, two percent are Native American, four percent are Asian, one percent is Black or African American, and fifty-four percent are White. A large percentage of advanced candidates (20%)

did not report a race or ethnicity. At both levels, approximately eighty percent of the candidates are female and approximately twenty percent are male. Evidence exists in the addendum exhibits that initial and advanced program candidates are diverse. According to the PEDS data, between the 2011-12 and 2013-14 academic years, candidate diversity has generally increased at both the initial and advanced levels. SOE recruiters are focusing on both the initial and advanced levels, recruiting both on and off campus, in order to maintain a diverse candidate population.

Recruitment efforts at the initial level are significant. A National Science Foundation grant provides Noyce Teacher Scholarships to candidates interested in STEM fields. The Student Services Office (SSO) works with the College Assistance Migrant Program and the Mini-Corp program to recruit ethnically diverse and bilingual candidates. CSUSM is a “Veteran Friendly” institution and the SSO recruits candidates from the military in addition to working with local community colleges. Many information and orientation sessions are held for prospective candidates on the campus. At the advanced level, recruitment efforts exist but they are not formalized or systematic. Advanced programs recruit from credential programs and via the P-12 partnerships that have been established by the institution. CSUSM is a federally-designated Hispanic-serving and Asian/Pacific Islander-serving institution. The SOE has been successful at both levels in recruiting Latino candidates and African-American candidates. The numbers of candidates who identify as Asian-American/ Pacific Islander is relatively small. The unit may want to consider ways to increase these numbers at the initial and advanced levels.

It was confirmed through interviews and school observations that both full-time and part-time initial and advanced candidates have the opportunity to work with diverse peers. The unit works with P-12 district advisory groups to determine the specific placement of full-time and part-time student interns and other professional roles to provide appropriate learning experiences. The School of Education (SOE) shares a unique relationship with the North County Professional Development Federation (NCPDF) that assures strong communication from the surrounding school districts. The school sites provided and schools attended during the onsite visit was very diverse by gender, ethnicity, academically and by socioeconomic levels.

Candidates observe and participate at highly diverse school settings as determined by the school profiles and corroborated by supervising teacher interviews. Courses being taught at several of the P-12 partnering schools allow for innovative ways for candidates to get practical experience and they provide an early relationship with district-wide personnel. All initial candidates participate in The Tutor Connection: A Community-Based Partnership for English Language Learning, a program that provides candidates with diverse experiences.

Interviews confirmed that initial and advanced programs include diverse placements. Placements are tracked by the program coordinators in a process that ensures that all candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practices that include students with diverse learning needs, which offers candidates the opportunity to demonstrate differentiation of instruction. Both field experiences and clinical practices allow time for reflection. These reflect feedback from clinical faculty and cooperating teachers or teacher supervisors, which

help teacher candidates develop strategies for improving student learning. Student work samples were provided demonstrating candidate reflection on how to help students who are reading below grade level and students with diverse needs, goals and backgrounds. Using TPE data the ES faculty decided to partner with the Speech Language Pathology (SLP) faculty to model co-teaching and rewrote course standards in EDM 627 to better meet the needs of the candidates. Diversity of field experience sites for clinical practice and field observations were confirmed by both Middle-Level and General Option programs candidates. Samples of evaluations that demonstrate areas of diversity and differentiation were provided. Lesson plan rubrics are provided to show the evaluation process.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

4.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

The unit is in the emerging stage of moving toward target relative to diversity. While the institution at large has plans and timelines related to addressing and advancing diversity issues on campus, there was no evidence of plans and timelines for these efforts at the SOE level. In the near future, it is anticipated that university efforts will require that the SOE develop more specific plans for programs and candidates but evidence of this was not in place at the time of the site visit.

Though plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance were not evident, there was clear evidence of a well-developed knowledge base for diversity and inclusion across all initial and advanced programs. Candidates and faculty noted their commitment to social justice and specific ways to demonstrate that commitment within a classroom setting.

Candidate recruitment efforts at the initial level are significant. Outreach by recruiters includes work with the community colleges, with the organizations in the region, with local high schools, within CSUSM, and in other appropriate venues. Faculty and staff are active in the community and in local P-12 settings in a manner that supports recruitment efforts.

The vice president for diversity has implemented a program to ensure that diversity is at the forefront of searches for all positions as CSUSM. Each search committee has a “diversity advocate” and a committee chair. It is mandatory that these two members of every committee receive a two-hour training to ensure that diversity is addressed in all aspects of the search process.

Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

4.3.a What AFIs are recommended for removal?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. The unit does not ensure that candidates have an opportunity of working with other diverse candidates.	ITP,ADV	The unit ensures that all candidates, initial and advanced, have an opportunity to work with other diverse candidates. Evidence exists in the exhibits that advanced program candidates are diverse. According to the PEDS data between 2011-12 and 2013-14, candidate diversity have generally increased or remained steady at the advanced levels. SOE recruiters are focusing on both the initial and advanced levels, recruiting both on and off campus, in order to maintain a diverse candidate population. At the initial level, these procedures and recruiting events are formalized. At the advanced level, they are less systematized and formalized but recruitment efforts are taking place.
2. The unit does not ensure field experiences for its part-time candidates with students from diverse groups and students with exceptionalities.	ITP	All programs in the unit require that all candidates in all programs have diverse field experiences. Field experiences are tracked by candidates and advisors to ensure that candidates work with learners from at least two racial or ethnic groups, English-language learners, and students with special needs.

Standard 4 **Met**

California Team Decision **Met**

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Overall Findings

Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

All of the unit's full-time, tenured faculty at the institution have earned doctorate degrees in their field of study, participate in contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels they supervise, and are meaningfully engaged in related scholarship as evidenced by updated research and creative activities for the present academic year (2014-2015) identified in the addendum and through interviews.

Faculty provide leadership in the profession, schools, and professional associations at state, national, and international levels. Examples of faculty scholarship include eight faculty trained as Diversity Advocates during 2011-2015. In 2014, there are 25 publications, 74 presentations, 13 external grants, 12 CSUSM grants, and nine theory into practice and applied scholarships. Examples of professional development activities in 2014 are Faculty Center Teaching Expo and RTP/WPAF workshops, CSUSM Research Colloquium presentation, New Faculty Institute, Seal of Biliteracy meetings, California Writing Project, Robotics training, Halualani and Associates Diversity Mapping meeting, Quality Online Learning and Teaching initiative, Educating Hispanic Students and Preparing Asian Bilingual Teachers Projects, Southern California Regional Meeting Regarding Common Core, and the California Teacher Credential Commission Think Tank.

Faculty know and understand the unit's conceptual framework and work to ensure that candidates master these standards. Based on interviews with faculty, faculty have an in-depth understanding of their fields and are teacher scholars who integrate what is known about their content fields, teaching, and learning in their own instructional practice. Diversity and technology are integrated throughout coursework, field experiences, and clinical practices. The unit and tenured and adjunct faculty systematically use multiple forms of assessments, such as the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), course evaluations and clinical experience evaluations, follow-up surveys of school employer evaluations, anonymous evaluations from candidates, peer discussions, and candidate feedback, in determining their effectiveness. Data, such as candidate performance on the CalTPA, are used by the unit to facilitate professional development and by the faculty to improve their practice.

Through the unit's Community Council, faculty collaborate regularly with P-12 practitioners and are actively engaged in a community of learners. Open communication is valued by all stakeholders, including candidates. Interviews with current candidates, recent graduates, unit faculty, and school-based faculty confirm that collaboration is a strength of the faculty where their voices are heard and valued.

Samples of course evaluations and other assessments were viewed onsite. In course evaluations, for example, candidates evaluate their instructors on being well-prepared, on their presentations, their sensitivity to individual needs of course materials and candidates themselves, their receptiveness to candidates, effective teaching, enthusiasm of instructor in

communicating the subject matter, and their showing genuine interest in students. Data of these samples indicate all instructors averaged between 4.5 and 5.0 on a 5-point scale.

The Status Report of SOE Priorities and Activities 2014-2015 identify priorities relevant to faculty as: develop tenure line faculty hiring priorities, bring one distinguished expert to the campus for the Hansen Symposium in spring 2015, document and designate courses that have service learning components, participate in the STEM Super Saturday, develop a mechanism for program data queries to review program data and develop action plans, develop a plan to increase the number of students in the dual language program, and develop tools for collecting data on measuring the impact of graduates on P-12 students and community.

Interviews with current candidates, recent graduates, faculty, and school-based faculty verify faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

5.2.b. Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has policies and practices that encourage faculty to be continuous learners. Faculty are aware of new and developing research in their fields and emerging theories and practice. They continue to expand their knowledge of and skills related to diversity, exceptionalities, and technology to facilitate their own professional work and to help candidates learn. They continue to provide high quality educational experience for teacher candidates and other school professionals and continue to examine candidate performance data to inform curriculum and program practices.

The unit's Community Council has provided open communication and continuous collaboration among faculty, school and P-12 educators, and other units to ensure that candidates and P-12 students are given high quality education. Continuous collaboration with colleagues in content disciplines and in school communities provide the support to help candidates develop multiple strategies for all P-12 students. Faculty make candidate and P-12 student learning central in their professional work. They are actively engaged in a community of learners and model good teaching. By promoting co-teaching for candidates and increasing classroom experiences from one day a week to four at the start of programs, faculty are able to provide integrated teaching and learning in classroom settings and smooth transitions in the work force. Current candidates and graduates commented on the positive modeling, continuous feedback, and continuous support given by faculty. Graduates added they continue to keep in touch with faculty for support in their careers.

5.2.b.i Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The unit's funding of the Distinguished Teacher in Residency (DTiR) for the unit's initial program provides a model for the CSU system. Selected through a rigorous and extensive process, these DTiR teachers hold a minimum of a master's degree and a valid credential in the areas they teach and supervise. During interviews with faculty, candidates, and graduates, comments were made on this exemplary program as providing teaching and learning experiences that are current school and classroom situations.

5.3 Areas of Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

None

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

None

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

None

Standard 5 **Met**

California Team Decision **Met**

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The on-site visit confirmed that the dean of the College of Education, Health, and Human Services (CEHHS) is the head of the professional education unit and that the School of Education (SOE), housed within the CEHHS, is responsible for the design, delivery, and implementation of all educator preparation programs. The dean and the director of the SOE have the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources to effectively operate the unit.

Questions were raised in the off-site report about the number of staff available to support the work of the EPP. Organizational charts provided in the addendum exhibits and confirmed through interviews with the administration, faculty, staff, and candidates indicate that the unit has sufficient staff to operate the unit. The dean of CEHHS has an associate dean, and the SOE

is led by a director (who reports to the dean) and an associate director. The College Community Council (CCC), which is comprised of the tenured faculty from CEHHS, is the organizing structure for coordinating policies and procedures, as well as for making recommendations to the dean. Subcommittees of the CCC address key issues in the unit (e.g., recruitment, candidate concern policy, curriculum). SOE programs have coordinators who report to the director. The Student Services Office (SSO), responsible for all academic advising and credentialing services, provides support for SOE candidates and programs. It is headed by a Director who reports to the dean. Interviews confirmed that the position of the assessment coordinator (November 2013) and the TPA coordinator (2008) are staffed and have become integral to the success of the unit in the cycle of continuous improvement.

The organizational chart in the addendum exhibits and the addendum itself clarifies that the dean, the associate dean, and the SOE director all have an assistant that supports their work. The SOE has an academic support assistant, and the SSO has a budget analyst and an administrative support assistant. Additionally, the unit has resources and personnel to implement the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), assist faculty with web pages, and to ensure timely communication in the unit. The availability and strength of these resources was confirmed through interviews with faculty, staff, and administration.

Through multiple interviews with faculty, it was confirmed that the unit practices shared governance with the ultimate governance authority for the unit residing with the dean. The SOE Community, which is comprised of all faculty and staff in the unit as well as representatives from the SSO, plays a significant role the governance process. The governance process, as described in unit's bylaws and in the Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines Handbook, was confirmed through these interviews.

As noted in the off-site report, policies, procedures, and requirements (including program plans and transition points) for initial and advanced candidates are described in multiple handbooks and other documents, as well as on the website, all of which are easily accessible to candidates and faculty. Cooperating teachers commented favorably during interviews about the SOE website that provides readily accessible forms and handbooks for their work with candidates.

The Distinguished Teacher-In-Residence (DTiR) program and the North County Professional Development Federation (comprised of local school partners) are structures that ensure that P-12 practitioners participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs at the initial level. An interview with the current DTiR confirms that this is an exemplary program whereby a practicing teacher spends two years working as a SOE faculty member who is responsible for teaching courses, supervising candidates, and increasing the theory-to-practice model.

Information on the recruitment and support of initial candidates was confirmed in interviews with candidates, faculty, and P-12 partners. Faculty and staff work with various programs on campus to recruit diverse candidates. Additionally, the university has an extensive partnership, called The Alliance, with ten local school districts. The work of the Alliance extends to all

campus programs and offices and supports P-12 partners from the region in ensuring that their students are college ready for CSUSM.

A recent reorganization of the SSO has resulted more intensive recruitment efforts that generally focus on recruitment for initial programs, but also include advanced programs. As noted in the off-site report, the IR did not provide examples and documents that describe the recruitment efforts for advanced programs. Advanced programs appear to rely on recruiting candidates from the credential program and word of mouth. The North County Professional Development Federation serves as a point for dissemination of advanced program opportunities.

The SSO serves as an advisement center and oversees academic advising for all initial and advanced programs in the unit. The unit ensures candidate access to advising and counseling by providing faculty advisors for all initial and advanced candidates. The SSO provides assistance during the credentialing process. Faculty advisors work with the credential analysts to monitor candidate progress. The Professional Education Programs Handbook, as well as the unit's web site, provide comprehensive information about the types of services and support that candidates may access. Credential analysts and advisors do extensive outreach to new and current candidates to ensure that they are aware of the curriculum expectations, program requirements, and entitlement procedures.

The Institutional Report (IR) presents a case that the unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations to support faculty, candidates, programs, and the unit. Budget allocations are provided in comparison to the other colleges. Another chart provides information on full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollments within the SOE. It appears that the CEHHS has had a slightly declining budget allocation over the past three years while the other colleges have had slight increase. It is difficult to verify whether or not the amount allocated to the CEHHS is sufficient when the budget sheets do not provide context.

Additional budget pages were provided to clarify budgetary allocations. Interviews with the dean, the unit budget analyst, the Associate Dean, and the SOE budget analyst confirm that the unit receives sufficient resources to ensure that faculty and candidates have the resources and support that they need to be successful.

The unit is guided by the CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) in relation to faculty workload, tenure and promotion as well as other faculty-related matters as described in the CBA and the Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines Handbook. According to the PPG Handbook, faculty members maintain 30 Total Workload Units (TWU) per year. Workload policies encourage faculty to engage in a wide range of professional activities which include teaching, service, research, and other creative activities. There are procedures that are described in governance documents, for the submission of the Research and Creative Activity Proposal as well as the Mission in Action Plans, which may result in the assignment of a plan that is the equivalent of a three-credit course. Guidelines are available for compensation for coordinating programs and field experiences, for chairing the culminating experience of master's candidates,

and for full-time CSUSM faculty members who teach or serve as dissertation chairs or members of the CSUSM/UCSD Joint Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership. Examination of faculty and adjunct loads as well as interviews with faculty, the CEHHS Associate Dean and CEHHS budget analyst, and the SOE budget analyst confirm that faculty workload is monitored closely to ensure compliance with the CBA. The faculty handbook provides information about advisement loads and compensation. At the advanced level, faculty members who are chairing the culminating experience of a master's candidate as well as those involved in the joint doctoral program receive compensation. It is not clear if faculty members who advise students are compensated for advisement at the initial and advanced levels.

The unit utilizes part-time faculty in teaching and supervision. Members of these groups appear to be well-integrated into the unit and full-time faculty. All of the adjuncts that were interviewed by the team held terminal degrees and felt supported by the unit.

The team was able to verify that technology integration is a priority for CSUSM and for the unit. Faculty and candidates have a rich array of technology resources to support candidates' learning and the teaching, research, and service activities of the faculty. A tour of the facilities provided clear evidence that the university and the unit place a high priority on ensuring that faculty and staff are supported in the use of technology. An interview with the Provost confirmed that computers are refreshed every 3-4 years and ensuring that the faculty have the knowledge, skills, and tools to prepare candidates to use technology as a teaching-learning tool. Evidence indicates that classrooms, faculty offices, the library, and other university facilities adequately support the research, teaching, and learning activities of the candidates and faculty members. Additionally, extensive faculty professional development related to technology is available and interviews with faculty and staff from Instructional Information and Technology Services indicated that unit faculty members take advantage of these resources. An exhibit describing the faculty Mission in Action (MAP) plans (assigned time for projects) as well as the list of externally funded projects indicate that faculty are engaged in activities that provide candidates with the latest technology-related innovations and resources (e.g., iPads, resources for middle-school science, Web 2.0 tools, robotics, integrating technology in science, cyber projects). Importantly, technology is available in the P-12 schools where candidates take courses. P-12 partners indicated that unit graduates candidates who embrace new technologies and enter their classroom and districts able to implement whatever technology the P-12 partners have available.

In summary, it appears that the unit has adequate technology resources to support faculty, candidates, and the assessment system.

An examination of the CSUSM Library and website confirmed the IR's description of the library holdings and resources. Faculty and candidates have access to sufficient and current library resources, curricular resources, and electronic information. The unit has an educational librarian who serves as liaison with the unit, assisting faculty in the selection and ordering of materials and in providing services for individual course needs. The library has a wide range of resources to support the mission and conceptual framework of the unit. A team member

visited the Hansen Curriculum Room and its extensive resources, as well as multiple stacks of books for young children and young adults, were confirmed during the visit.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

6.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit was recently part of a reorganization effort that combined the SOE with other schools. The current arrangement provides for shared governance while allowing program faculty to maintain the authority to plan, implement, and assess their programs. Based on the documentation provided in the IR, the addendum, and on interviews with the dean and faculty members, governance structures provide opportunity for shared governance and regular input from faculty on policies and procedures in the unit.

A collaborative budgeting process in the CEHHS allows for faculty to participate in the process of setting budgetary priorities. This process has provided a mechanism for the dean to advocate for new hires and to receive funding for accreditation activities. Importantly, it has allowed the dean to support candidates through the creation of structures such as the Student Services Office. Extended learning opportunities (self-supporting programs) provide some revenue that allows the dean to support SOE activities. Faculty members are supported with resources for teaching, research, service, professional development, and technology integration. There are opportunities for faculty to submit research and action plans that support the mission of the unit. These plans carry released time or reassigned time to allow the faculty member to pursue scholarly interests that support the unit and its candidates.

Based on the documentation provided in the IR and the addendum as well as visit to campus facilities and interviews with faculty, staff, candidates, and P-12 partners, technology resources and integration is a strength of the unit. Candidates and faculty have access to up-to-date technology and professional development. Candidates have the opportunity to be well-trained as professionals who are able to use the latest technology to help P-12 students and clients learn.

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

6.3.a What AFIs are recommended for removal?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. The unit lacks adequate personnel resources to support its assessment system.	ITP,ADV	<p>The position of Assessment Coordinator was created and filled in 2007. A TPA coordinator was hired in 2008. These coordinators appear to collaborate, along with the faculty, on data gathering and analysis. Additionally, faculty members are provided with release time for assessment and accreditation activities. The unit employs five credential analysts to assist in admissions, evaluation, advisement, and credential recommendation for all candidates.</p> <p>An organizational chart provided in the addendum documents and interviews with staff indicate that distribution of administrative assistants, work study allocations, or graduate students is sufficient to support the unit.</p>

Standard 6 **Met**

California Team Decision **Met**

CTC Common Standards requirements not reflected in NCATE Unit Standards

1.5 The Education Unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

The Director of Student Services, who works with several credential analysts, oversees the credential recommendation process. The credential analysts are responsible for ensuring that all candidates applying for a credential have met all the requirements prior to formal recommendation for the credential. Interviews with the credential analysts confirmed that there is a mechanism by which they communicate requirements to candidates. Through

electronic communication, credential analysts also provide a progress report to candidates. During the interview, the credential analysts shared the database that guides their advising of students. Candidate files are kept in secured offices in the Department of Student Services. In addition to paper documents, electronic files are also kept for each candidate.

Candidates are informed of their progress towards meeting credential requirements at various points in the credential program, including admissions, the end of each semester, and a final exit review. Candidates confirmed that they receive regular updates on their progress towards meeting credential requirements.

The credential analysts are knowledgeable of the regulations surrounding each credential. The Education Services Office ensures that each analyst remains up to date with CTC requirements by providing them with financial support to attend relevant meetings and web casts. In a meeting with the credential analysts, they confirmed that they are asked to attend conferences on a regular basis. Thus, the credential analysts serve as a resource on CTC regulations for faculty and staff.

6.1 Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development.

Candidates receive support and advice from program coordinators and academic advisors/credential analysts who work with each individual program. The academic advisors/credential analysts ensure that everyone in the Student Services Office who advises students are kept up to date with CTC requirements. Interviews with the program coordinators and advisors confirmed that they meet with students on a regular basis. The academic advisors confirmed that students must maintain a 3.0 GPA in order to continue in the program. Candidates confirmed they feel supported by the faculty and staff in the Student Services Office and they are receiving the necessary advice and assistance to meet their professional and academic goals.

Program Coordinators work closely with the University Supervisor to ensure that clinical placements and evaluations are completed to meet program requirements. Candidates in the Multiple and Single Subject programs receive support from a coordinator for the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). Candidates receive information on the TPA through information meetings. The Student Services Staff confirmed that they work closely with the TPA Coordinator to ensure that they receive accurate information on the passing scores of candidates as they complete each task of the TPA.

6.2 Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements.

Information for each program can be found in a dedicated web site and printed materials (such as the University catalogue). Program web sites have information on clinical practice, academic requirements, required examinations, and forms that need to be completed. Additionally, The Student Services Office also conducts monthly meetings to make sure that all candidates have the opportunity to be informed of program requirements. Academic advisors are also available

to provide information. Candidates stated they are aware of their program requirements and know whom to contact should they have any questions.

6.3 The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Candidates are assessed on a regular basis to ensure they are making progress towards meeting credential requirements. Academic advisors stated that candidates must have a grade of C+ or better in each course and they must maintain a 3.0 GPA. In addition to academic requirements, candidates are assessed on their disposition and a statement of concern is generated for candidates who are not meeting program expectations. In a meeting with administrators, it was confirmed that the faculty works closely with the Director of Student Services to ensure that a stated procedure is followed to resolve the statement of concern.

Standard Findings

California's Common Standards not addressed by the NCATE Standards are **Met**.

Program Reports

Teaching Credential Programs

Preliminary Multiple Subject Credential and Single Subject Credential

Program Design

Credential preparation programs offered in the CSUSM-School of Education (SOE) are the Multiple Subject program, which also includes Integrated Credential Program (ICP) and Middle Level program, as well as the Single Subject program. Both the multiple and single subject programs include an authorization to teach English learners.

Interviews with program faculty confirmed that each program is continually monitored by a designated program coordinator, clinical placement director, and faculty who ensure that programs reflect a purposeful, interrelated, developmentally designed sequence of coursework and clinical practice experiences for candidates. Program Coordinators, field placement directors, and other representative faculty, including the TPA Coordinator, serve on the Program Coordinators and Graduate Programs Committee that meets twice a month. The Director of the School of Education gives regular reports containing information about the SOE and the College of Health and Human Services. The Director of the SOE also shares information from the School Partners Advisory Committee and takes information to that committee from this group. Members of the Advisory Board, employers and district personnel confirm that they value the reciprocal relationship with the faculty and staff of CSUSM. Interviews with Program Coordinators, the field placement director and the TPA coordinator confirm a very strong culture of collaboration between all constituencies.

Collaboration is also evident in the fieldwork component of the program. Program coordinators hold informational meetings with the on-site school liaisons (OSL) twice a year and all programs present training workshops for cooperating teachers (CTs) and OSLs on general program information, requirements for candidates, state requirements, and other program expectations. District Supervisors, on-site liaisons and cooperating teachers agree that the collaboration with the SOE is beneficial in their ability to support the program's expectations. Advisory board members mentioned that the collaboration leads to successful grant funded projects.

Clinical Practice is woven throughout each program beginning with observations and participation while teacher candidates are engaged in initial coursework followed by full-time teaching designed to meet the needs of each program. The candidates meet the university supervisor, become familiar with school practices, and become acquainted with campus administrative personnel, cooperating teacher/s, and students. Review of program documents and syllabi verify that both Multiple and Single Subject programs require a total of 14 units of clinical practice. Candidates in all programs (except ICP) are placed at two school sites, one for Clinical Practice I and a different site for Clinical Practice II to ensure a broad and appropriate experience. Because ICP candidates engage in practicum experiences in additional school sites prior to clinical practice, they are placed at the same site, different grade levels, for the clinical

practice experiences. Recent graduates confirmed that their Clinical Practice experiences were instrumental in the effectiveness of their preparation to begin their teaching careers.

One of the great strengths of the program is the Distinguished Teacher in Residence program that brings the finest teachers in the region to the SOE as faculty for a two-year period as additional faculty and clinical support. Program coordinators, recent graduates and current candidates agree that the Distinguished Teacher in Residence program provides credibility and a practitioner perspective that is invaluable to the program.

Course of Study

SOE faculty members, in yearly consultation with local districts, have collectively designed and continuously updated an appropriate course of study that is supportive of the SOE mission and core values. A review of program documents and syllabi confirms that the program maintains an effective sequence of coursework. The initial credential program design, requiring 35-38 units, weaves clinical practice and field experience throughout the course of study. All programs deliver courses that are developmentally sequenced and allow candidates to gain a firm foundation on a perspective of social justice and developmental issues in education, as well as provide an opportunity for candidates to develop as reflective practitioners. The remainder of the semester is comprised of a literacy course for all programs, mathematics and English/language arts foundations courses for multiple subject and methods-specific courses for single subject. The second semester is a continuation of the Teaching and Learning course with a particular emphasis on the principles of universal design, lesson design, and dealing with a diverse student population. The literacy course sequence is continued for multiple subjects while single subject includes courses on interdisciplinary learning and a reflective practice. The second semester includes the science and social studies foundations courses for multiple subjects. Specific content methods courses are included in both programs. Candidates and academic advisors confirmed the sequence of courses in the program.

The Multiple Subject Program with the Middle Level Certificate is designed to prepare teachers to work with adolescents in grades 5-9. This program provides candidates with the flexibility to teach in elementary and middle schools, as well as in an academic subject in grade nine in a high school. The ICP allows candidates to concurrently complete a baccalaureate degree (BA) in Liberal Studies from the College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences, and a post-baccalaureate Multiple Subject Credential from the School of Education.

The program threads university professional education coursework with clinical practice throughout the candidate's experience. Program completers confirm that the courses of study have been designed to enable candidates to experience a variety of different teaching situations by being placed in two different settings for their clinical practice. Coursework and field assignments are clearly connected and sequenced as verified by a review of the syllabi and interviews with faculty, program coordinators, current candidates and recent graduates.

Candidate Competence

Candidate performance in both Multiple and Single subject programs are based on multiple assessments upon admission to the program and at various transition points throughout. Academic advisors confirmed that they work closely with candidates to ensure they are meeting program requirements. A fair, valid, and reliable assessment of the candidate's status with respect to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) is embedded throughout the programs' design and assessed by faculty during coursework and the university supervisor and cooperating teacher during clinical practice as verified by interviews with program faculty and university supervisors. An examination of syllabi show each credential course is responsible for addressing specific TPEs and TPA tasks concepts. Therefore each course has identified Teaching Performance Expectations that are primarily and secondarily covered in the course of study. Interviews with program faculty, both fulltime and adjunct, as well as with program coordinators confirm the strong connection between course development and the TPE's. Current candidates and recent graduates agree that they have multiple opportunities at various points in the program to practice, develop and demonstrate competency in the TPEs in coursework and clinical practice and in order to complete the four TPA tasks. Information on the TPAs is provided through program advisors and the TPA Coordinator.

To further support learning and professional development, single subject candidates commence compiling, in first semester coursework, a comprehensive TPE digital portfolio on Taskstream to provide evidence that they are successfully meeting all TPE competencies.

Interviews with the program coordinators and university supervisors confirmed that site supervisors are appropriately qualified to supervise candidates and that thoughtful consideration is given to match candidates with site supervisors. Interviews confirm that university supervisors formally observe candidates four to five times each semester, give candidates written observations, feedback and recommendations at a post-conference for each observation. Recent graduates and current candidates indicate that the level of support provided by the supervisors, cooperating teachers and faculty is important to their preparation. Supervisors from all levels meet regularly each semester for training and to confer about candidates as they move from beginning clinical practice to advanced clinical practice with a new supervisor. Interviews with supervisors and program faculty confirm this critical interaction. The university supervisors also collaborate with the cooperating teacher/s and prepare a final written summary each semester as well as completing the TPE Assessment form. Information on both the summary and assessment forms is based on collaborative sharing, data and observations from the supervisor and cooperating teachers.

Findings on Standards

After a review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Mild/Moderate Disabilities and Moderate/Severe Disabilities with Intern

Program Design

Leadership, Communication, Collaboration, and Stakeholder Involvement

The Coordinators of the California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) Preliminary Education Specialist (ES) credential program meet monthly with faculty who teach and supervise in the ES program. Agenda items for the meetings include coordination of program components, examination of assessment data, planning program revisions, and discussions that guide supervisor and cooperating teacher training. Bi-monthly meetings with the Program Coordinators across the School of Education (e.g., Educational Administration, Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist), the Student Services Center representative, and the Director of the School of Education provide opportunities to collaborate and to ensure quality management of recruitment, entry, and program completion of ES credential candidates. The Director reports directly to the Dean of the College of Education, Health, and Human Services and oversees the daily operations of the School of Education within the college.

Interviews with employers, faculty, program directors, and candidates indicated that the ES program has strong, long-standing clinical and intern partnerships with San Diego and Riverside County stakeholder school districts and a close partnership with the North Coastal Consortium Special Education Local Planning Area (SELPA). Program specialists from partner districts regularly teaching or conduct clinical supervision as adjunct faculty in the program. Former program graduates and area special educators identified as exemplary teachers serve as adjunct faculty, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers. Documentation reviewed highlights the unique university/district collaboration known as the Distinguished Teacher in Residence program which selects the finest teachers in the region to join the School of Education as faculty for a two-year period. This provides the ES program exceptional faculty and clinical supervisors.

Program Options

Since the Fall 2011 semester, two new Preliminary Education Specialist program options have been offered in the School of Education (SOE) at California State University San Marcos (CSUSM). Program directors, partners, and current candidates state that candidates may transition into an internship role with a partnership district after the candidate completes the Mild/Moderate portion of the credential program while awaiting the final Moderate/Severe capstone course. The program is unique in that both Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Education Specialist standards are infused into all coursework, with only the capstone course and an additional Moderate/Severe clinical practice required for a candidate to add the Moderate/Severe credential to the Mild/Moderate credential. Approximately half the candidates choose to stay the extra semester/year to add the Moderate/Severe credential. The program also provides the option for candidates who have their authorization to teach English learners to be considered for Internships with partnership districts. There usually are no more than one or two interns per year.

Reports from candidates, adjuncts, supervisors and faculty indicate strong communication. Candidates confirmed that communication and support from program coordinators and credential analysts keep them well informed and the flexibility of the program allows for changes that strengthen the program. Candidates, program completers, and employers confirmed in interviews that faculty work together to ensure skills needed to learn and adapt to current classroom needs are incorporated into lessons, presentations, and planning. Employers indicate that completers from CSUSM are exceptional since they begin with the ability to coordinate Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meetings from the beginning with little need for additional supervision or direction.

Course of Study - Curriculum and Field Experiences for Program Options

Faculty interviews indicated, and program directors and candidates confirmed, that the process of knowledge and skills presentation is taught in a very meaningful fashion, starting with a review of the law, introduction of IEPs (Individual Education Plan), Assessment and program accommodations for goal development. The process leads into a strong emphasis on collaboration with parents and teachers in the general education setting. Diversity is also emphasized to include work with those from differing cultural backgrounds as well as differing abilities. Reports reviewed at the site visit indicated that these diversity areas are frequently reviewed during field experiences and clinical practice.

Option 1:

Concurrent Multiple Subject and Preliminary Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Disabilities Education Specialist with Masters

In Option 1, in addition to completing the Preliminary Education Specialist program and completing the clinical experiences, candidates have two prior semesters of fulltime coursework and clinical experiences. Clinical experiences include at least a week of special education experiences in diverse K -12 settings and clinical practice in two different elementary general education settings along with the education specialist (ES) specialized literacy course. Successful candidates complete the remaining Mild/Moderate Education Specialist credential courses and clinical practice in a third semester as Master's candidates. Candidates may also elect to complete two additional courses to meet the Moderate/Severe requirements.

Option 2:

Non Concurrent--Preliminary Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Disabilities Education Specialist Traditional and Intern

Candidates who hold a valid basic teaching credential and complete the Semester 1 and 2 courses plus a 50-day (10-week) clinical experience may opt for the Add On option. These candidates will then receive the Mild/Moderate ES credential. Intern candidates must also hold the authorization to teach English learners prior to taking an intern assignment. To further add on the Moderate/Severe ES credential, candidates complete an additional capstone course and 7-week clinical practice. Candidates with a Single Subject base credential are further prepared in elementary methods by completing elementary literacy and math methods courses.

Candidate Competence

Education Specialist candidates are assessed via shared and credential-specific assessments. Interviews with candidates and faculty stated that candidates are oriented to assessment requirements through cohort meetings, course expectations, clinical practice orientations, and the School of Education ES clinical practice website. TaskStream is employed for submission and analysis of candidates' performance on each assessment. Data are aggregated, by program option (i.e., Concurrent, Traditional Add On, and Intern Add On) to determine program and candidate strengths and areas for improvement. Candidates, university, and district supervisors agreed that candidates are well prepared to teach students with either Mild/Moderate or Moderate /Severe disabilities. The candidates start early in their courses to review assessments and make adaptations and accommodations for K-12 students in their lesson plans.

Assessments Shared by Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe ES Credentials

Interviews of program coordinators indicated that the ES program option strands of Moderate/Severe and Mild/Moderate credentials share two common assessments. The first, the Professional Disposition assessment, is used by all candidates' instructors and clinical practice supervisors (in coordination with cooperating teachers/intern support providers) for candidates enrolled in clinical practice. Each candidate also conducts a final self-assessment and sets dispositional goals as part of the Individual Transition Development Plan. Program directors, faculty and candidates stated that those who demonstrate difficulties with dispositions, coursework, or clinical performance may supplement a remediation action plan through the School of Education Statement of Concern process which structures and tracks candidate progress. A second shared assessment, administered in Assessment for Planning and Instruction, is the Assessment Case Study, for which candidates complete a comprehensive assessment and IEP preparation case study with a target student in the candidate's clinical practice setting. This product is assessed using a 4-point rubric.

Assessments Unique to Mild/Moderate ES Credential

The Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Teaching Performance Expectations Clinical Practice Assessment is the clinical practice assessment tool used by each candidate's university supervisor and cooperating teacher (or support provider, for an intern) to assess a candidate's competence on specially-constructed Education Specialist Teaching Performance Expectations in the 10-week (or, for interns, two-semester) Mild/Moderate clinical practice. This assessment has been expressly constructed to provide clarity and specificity in relation to CTC's 16 Education Specialist Program Design Standards and the six Mild/Moderate Disabilities specialty area standards. The instrument rates a candidate on a 4-point Likert scale. To be recommended for a Mild/Moderate credential, a candidate must be assessed by both the university supervisor and cooperating teacher/intern support provider as having achieved at least the "meets" standard (a score of 3) on all TPE statements. Additionally the Principled Literacy Design for a Student with Autism assignment is used as a fourth critical assessment task. The lesson design is assessed using a 4-point rubric. To calibrate reliable scoring, selected submissions are double scored by instructors.

Assessments Unique to Moderate/Severe ES Credential

The Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Teaching Performance Expectations Clinical Practice Assessment is the clinical practice assessment tool used by each candidate's university supervisor and cooperating teacher (or support provider, for an intern) to assess a candidate's competence on Education Specialist TPEs in the Moderate/Severe clinical practice, which occurs at the end of the candidate's program. The TPE statements included in this assessment have been specially constructed and expressly expanded to provide clarity and specificity particularly in relation to CTC's eight Moderate/Severe Disabilities specialty area standards. The instrument rates the candidate on a 4-point Likert scale. To be recommended for the Moderate/Severe credential, a candidate must be judged by the university supervisor and cooperating teacher/intern support provider as having achieved at least the "meets" standard (a score of 3) on all TPE statements. Additionally, a Student and Family Case Study, completed in the capstone course is used as a fourth critical assessment task. The case study is assessed using a 4-point rubric. To calibrate reliable scoring, selected submissions are double scored by instructors.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)

Program Design

The CTEL Certificate Program at California State University San Marcos is a program within the Master of Arts in Education programs offered in the School of Education. According to the CTEL Program Coordinator and Faculty, a majority of courses are taught by adjuncts who are working in the field. Candidates and adjuncts describe this as a strength, as the teaching faculty bring relevant and practical information.

Interviews with the program coordinator, faculty and candidates confirmed that there are multiple pathways into the CTEL classes. Primarily, candidates take CTEL courses as a stand-alone certificate or as part of the Master of Arts in Education. The stand-alone CTEL certificate exists for candidates who received a teaching credential in another state or who received a credential prior to the revised California credential. The program coordinator consults regularly with the credential analyst in the office of Student Services to ensure that candidates in the stand-alone option are progressing. When a candidate starts the program, the credential analyst informs the CTEL program coordinator. When the candidate completes the program and the culminating portfolio, the program coordinator notifies the credential analyst who recommends the candidate for the certificate. According to the credential analyst, there are set procedures that trigger a review. Candidates who complete the CTEL or meet criteria through partial exam state that they were recommended for their certificate in a timely manner.

According to the program coordinator and documents reviewed, transfer or out of state candidates are identified when they apply for admissions and their transcripts are reviewed. For example, if a special education candidate applies for admission and needs CTET courses, the special education advisor will notify the CTET program coordinator. This information allows for sufficient courses to be scheduled. The CTET certificate program consists of 4 classes designed to be completed in 2 terms. Candidates and completers confirm that they can complete the program in two terms if they chose.

The program coordinator schedules monthly faculty meetings during which program issues and standards are addressed. Currently the faculty confirms that they are re-aligning the curriculum and are looking at syllabi to modify content if necessary. Per adjunct faculty, they are encouraged to provide input into course content and assignments. Adjunct faculty describe how the program coordinator works closely with faculty to ensure that any modifications are consistent with the course learning outcomes and CTET standards. Candidates and graduates stated that the program met their needs and they did not provide any feedback for change.

Course of Study

The CTET stand –alone certificate program consists of 12 units of coursework (4 courses) and a final electronic portfolio to demonstrate mastery of the CTET standards. The four (4) courses are offered at the MA-level so that candidates completing the CTET program can apply their courses as electives towards a Master of Arts in Education.

Interviews with the program coordinator confirmed that the CTET program is designed so that multiple graduate level courses contain CTET competency standards. This allows additional opportunities for candidates to complete the certificate in two semesters should a course be cancelled. Courses are offered in the evening so candidates who are working in schools can participate. Candidates for the CTET certificate can also combine classes with tests to be approved for the certificate.

There are four basic CTET courses for those pursuing the stand alone certificate, each of which address specific CTET standards as follow: EDUC 646 (standards 4 & 5), 641 (Standard 6), 647 (standards 7 & 8) and EDUC 602 (Standards 9 & 10). Assignments that address the standards are embedded in each class. EDUC 602 is the only class that is offered on-line. Because CTET requirements are embedded in additional classes, candidates for the CTET have options of taking a replacement class that addresses the standards should the class they need be unavailable. For example, If EDUC 646 is not available in any given term, a candidate could take EDUC 606 instead, and still be assessed on standards 4 & 5. Candidates and recent graduates confirm that they have been able to complete the program by taking one of the offered classes to meet each standard.

Although there is no separate clinical placement for the CTET program, the assignments linked to classes are field based. Interviews with faculty and the program coordinator confirmed that many of the candidates in the classes are completing internships in special education or

educational administration so have access to programs and data. If the candidate is not in a placement, faculty help the candidates access the necessary data or information. Additionally, candidates can pair up with others who do have school based placements. Finally, there is a menu of choices for assignments that address the same standards. Faculty and adjunct faculty agree that the assignments are applied and feel that these are strengths of the program. Candidates and completers felt that their courses were relevant and meaningful and that they were able to immediately apply their learning in real life settings. They confirm that the faculty supported them as they completed the program, and provided them with information they needed to complete the field based assignments.

Faculty stated they are actively engaged in program modification, curriculum alignment activities and syllabi review. Specifically, faculty members compare the revised standard nine requirements with their existing program, and modifying as necessary to address the additions. Faculty and documentation confirm that they participate in alignment activities and provide feedback through the monthly meetings.

Recently, adjunct and faculty confirm that there has been a change in the way signature assignments are graded. Specifically, instructors use rubrics that align with the CTET standards to score signature assignments. Candidates then upload their signature assignments and their rubric to their electronic portfolio. Candidates and graduates describe the process as straightforward and believe they have sufficient guidance from faculty to successfully complete their portfolio.

According to the Program Coordinator and faculty, there are many opportunities for program faculty and stakeholders to interact and to provide input. Faculty and adjuncts confirm that they regularly discuss their ideas related to course development with the program coordinator. An exit survey completed by candidates provides the program coordinator with information about program effectiveness including systems that support the candidate such as Candidate Services. Data, candidates and recent graduates confirm that course evaluations are completed.

Candidate Competence

According to the program coordinator, adjunct faculty, and fulltime faculty, candidates are assessed on signature assignments through the use of a rubric that evaluates competence on the CTET standards. These assessments are used to complete the electronic portfolio that is evaluated by the program coordinator. At the end of the program, candidates complete an exit survey during which they evaluate the overall program. As part of that evaluation, they reflect on their own learning throughout the program.

The final portfolio is the culminating activity. Once a candidate is finished with courses and their portfolio is approved, they are recommended by student services. Candidates and recent completers report that they were guided through the portfolio process in each class. Faculty

confirms that the syllabi specifically describe the signature assignment that is to be added to the portfolio.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Added Authorization in Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorders

This AASE: Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) program was approved by the Committee on Accreditation in February 2010. Currently there are no candidates in the ASD program and the last completers exited this program in summer of 2013. The institution has kept the Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization program open as an option for past Special Education teachers who may need to add an ASD authorization to an existing credential. In previous years the program drew a large number of candidates but now that the preparation and authorization to teach students with ASD is included in the Mild/Moderate Disabilities preparation program and the majority of teachers in the field have earned an authorization to teach students with ASD the need for the Added Authorization ASD has decreased. Since there are no candidates or recent completers, the team was not able to determine findings on the three program standards for this program.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of program leadership, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

**Reading and Literacy Added Authorization and
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential**

The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization and Reading/Literacy Specialist Credential program originally approved in 2000 has been reconstituted to reflect Common Core, new CTC standards, and cutting-edge technology. Through interviews, program leadership and faculty indicated that the previous program has been taught-out, with only three students near completion, and no others behind them. No students completed during the previous academic year. Also, no students have been enrolled in the new program, although CTC has granted approval, and program faculty report that plans are underway to begin recruitment.

Within the new program design is the intent to teach the courses both online, and in the classroom, whether at the university or within the classrooms of partner school districts. The program will serve 28 school districts in northern San Diego County and Riverside County. The plans anticipate a full-time faculty of five, including the program coordinator. The Reading and

Literacy Authorization program consists of 18 units, and the Reading/Literacy Specialist Credential is a 30-unit endeavor. This has been confirmed through program documents and interviews of program leadership and faculty.

Program leadership and faculty have indicated during interviews that the program has been, and will continue to be, based on 12 “guiding principles” garnered from various international literacy organizations, and the university’s Mission Statement. Additionally, a focus upon Common Core will allow the new program to emphasize digital literacy, and to utilize digital tools that have not previously existed. New CTC standards speak to program evaluation, thereby inviting a new course in which candidates learn to assess and evaluate reading/literacy programs. Program leadership and faculty stress the importance of technology. Digital portfolios which contain signature assignments and other evidence of learning will also distinguish the new program from the previous one. Further, candidates will be expected to identify a child’s reading strengths and weaknesses, and to identify strategies for addressing weaknesses. Within the new program students will learn about research based diagnostics and remediation strategies accessible through digital sources that may not have been previously available. Other pertinent strategies not available digitally, but still considered effective, will also be utilized. As part of the program, candidates will be assigned to classrooms in the region where they will assist cooperating teachers in the development and implementation of strategies directed at specific students.

Interviews with faculty and partner groups confirmed that the current program enjoys a close partnership with the North County Professional Development Federation (NCPDF) where faculty members share information with other universities and companion entities. That this strong relationship exists between the NCPDF and all CSUSM credential programs was confirmed at a meeting of the School of Education Advisory Board. This relationship is expected to continue as the new program commences. The program coordinator serves as the director of the San Marcos Writing Project which includes an invitational five-week summer institute for K-12 teachers. Those who complete this institute receive a certificate of attendance and become official teacher consultants of the writing project. Completers are eligible to receive 6 units of graduate credit which can be applied toward the Reading Specialist Credential and the Master’s degree. Program leadership expressed in interviews a confidence that these activities and relationships will continue with the new program. With particular regard for the community served by the university, program leadership and faculty stress the importance of tailoring courses and assignments to address the unique challenges of the second-language learners, assuring full access to the curriculum. They focus on the need to create “literacy leaders” among all candidates. The program coordinator serves the CSUSM campus as the chair of the Faculty Senate, as confirmed by the following California State University website: https://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Campus_Senate/campus_senate_chairs.shtml

Through interviews, it was indicated that Program leadership and staff meet weekly to discuss candidate progress and to review program effectiveness. Additionally, twice a month they participate as members of the “Community Council,” (also known as “Governance”) which consists of all School of Education faculty. In that venue program faculty seek out the views of

other faculty members while contributing their insights, as well. Through interviews they expressed the belief that the sharing of experiences is beneficial to all. In addition, the university's Writing Center has been tapped to support candidates, many of whom are second-language learners.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Bilingual Authorization

Program Design

Documents, handbooks and the School of Education website indicate that the Bilingual Authorization (BILA) Program at California State University San Marcos is administered as a concurrent component of the teacher credential programs. Candidates are able to earn their BILA in Spanish either concurrently with their Multiple, Single or Education Specialist credential, or as an add-on authorization to an existing credential or equivalent (EL Authorization). The Bilingual Authorization program has the full support of the faculty and staff in the School of Education as verified in interviews with program coordinators and faculty.

A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty and recent graduates confirm that the BILA courses are taught in Spanish and the program has three requirements:

1. Successful completion of two Bilingual Authorization courses (3 units each – in Spanish) Fall semester: EDUC 653 – Biliteracy I, Contexts for Learning; Spring semester: EDUC 654-Biliteracy II, Methodology and Cultural Contexts;
2. Successful completion of a field experience in a bilingual setting or its equivalent Spring semester: EDUC 655 Practicum Instruction in Bilingual Settings; and
3. Successful completion of a Spanish language assessment (CSET LOTE III)

Course of Study

A review of syllabi indicate that theories, research and topics on second language acquisition, bilingual education and culturally responsive teaching are covered in the teacher credential program as part of the SB-2042 credential. Candidates in the BILA program build upon this knowledge to focus on ELs in bilingual settings. Current candidates and recent graduates verify that the curriculum provides a depth of knowledge regarding current research-based theories and practices in the specialized instruction of bilingual education and ELD Theories addressing second language acquisition, as well as current brain research, sociolinguistics, and culturally responsive pedagogy.

Candidate Competence

Interviews with recent graduates and program faculty confirm that candidates have extensive opportunities to develop pedagogical competence utilizing a variety of strategies as defined by

the four Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) tasks and the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) that are woven throughout each credential program. On-site liaisons and university supervisors indicate that clinical practice, both beginning (CPI) and advanced (CP II), occurs in schools under the supervision and coaching of a cooperating teacher and a university supervisor, as well as an on-site liaisons designated by the school site. University supervisors, on-site liaisons, and the cooperating teacher interviews confirm that they work together during clinical practice to ensure that the candidate becomes progressively competent to take over the classroom and to provide formative feedback to inform the candidate's progress. Review of the course syllabi confirm that each credential course is responsible for addressing specific TPEs and TPA tasks concepts.

Current candidates and recent graduates confirm that there are multiple opportunities at various points in the program to practice, develop and demonstrate competency in the TPEs in coursework and clinical practice and in order to complete the four TPA tasks. A fair, valid, and reliable assessment of the candidate's status with respect to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) is embedded throughout the programs' design and assessed by faculty during coursework and the university supervisor and cooperating teacher during clinical practice as determined by the review of program documents and interviews with program faculty and university supervisors.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Services Credential Programs

Educational Leadership Programs Preliminary Administrative Services Program

Program Design: Leadership, Communication, Collaboration, and Stakeholder Involvement

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program is led by a program coordinator who is assisted by one other full-time School of Education faculty member. These individuals meet frequently to coordinate components of the program, examine assessment data, plan program revisions, and address student needs. Program activities are coordinated with other credential programs through bi-monthly meetings of the program coordinator and Graduate Program Committees comprised of the coordinators of the School of Education's several credential programs, the assessment coordinator, the Student Services Center representative, and the Director of the School of Education. The director reports to the Dean of the College of Education, Health, and Human Services and oversees the daily operations of the School of Education within the college. The Director of the Student Services Center and attendant staff confer regularly with the program coordinator to ensure quality management of recruitment,

entry, and program completion of Preliminary Administrative Services Credential candidates. Interviews with faculty, the program coordinator, partners, and stakeholders confirmed that program faculty members remain current through active service in the field. The program coordinator is the president-elect of the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA), and the full-time faculty member is on the board of directors of that state-wide organization.

The CSUSM program leading to the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential has strong, long-standing partnerships with San Diego and Riverside County stakeholder school districts. There is also a close partnership with the North County Professional Development Federation, a resource that includes professional development opportunities. The San Diego County District Leaders' Round Table program offers feedback, and support of candidates participating in field experiences in the schools. Further, documentation and interviews with the education advisory boards indicate that guidance is provided to all credential programs, including the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program. This information is confirmed through an interview with School of Education stakeholders, including school district officials, students, faculty, and members of the business community. Former program graduates, now serving in school leadership positions, serve as guest lecturers and on panel presentations to share their experiences in the program and the connection to their work in administration with program candidates. Further, the program faculty maintains contact with program graduates via frequent email bursts, and through a survey designed to elicit program improvement suggestions. This information is confirmed by members of the School of Education Advisory Board, program graduates, and program faculty.

In 2013, new standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential were adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). In 2014-15, CSUSM began the transition process toward the new program standards. In August of 2014, program leadership submitted a transition document to the CTC. To update the current program, course names, course descriptions, and the syllabi were modified to meet the new standards, as were the admissions standards. Syllabi were approved by the CSUSM University Curriculum Committee in February 2015. The revised courses and performance expectations will be included in the program beginning in fall 2015. In addition, the CTC requirements for admission were increased from candidates with a teaching credential to candidates with a clear credential. Interviews with program leadership and faculty noted adopted changes in admission requirements that included a pre-requisite experience of five years before a candidate can apply for the credential.

Course of Study: Structure of Coursework and Field Experiences in the Credential Program

Program structure showed that candidates in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program are enrolled in the 24-unit credential program, which includes 19 units of face-to-face classes and five units of field experience. This information is supported by program documents in addition to interviews with current students, program completers, faculty and program leadership. Candidates and faculty speak to a strong emphasis on "social justice" and educational equity concepts as significant aspects of the program. Interviews with university

administration confirmed the institution's strong emphasis on "diversity," a key component of the program as identified by program leadership and faculty. Although students and faculty support the notion that technology is used extensively throughout the program, there are no online courses offered. There are no alternative pathways to the program (i.e., internships), and courses are taught sequentially. Candidates may enter the program only once a year through a cohort model. Program completers and current students emphasized the value of the cohort model as it promotes collaboration among candidates. Syllabi reviewed supported faculty and program leadership statements that course and field experience outcomes are based on the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). All classes are conducted at the university or at school sites. The field experiences are conducted at the candidates' work site and are supervised by a school administrator and full-time university faculty. Additionally, according to program graduates, current students, and faculty, candidates visit schools outside their own school districts thereby gaining experience at sites beyond their immediate area. They also observe administrators at different grade levels than are served at the candidate's work site. Current candidates expressed appreciation for that facet of the program.

In a unique approach, students take two courses each semester, one after the other, with a field experience component bridging the two courses. Program leadership and adjunct faculty indicate that one of the two courses will be taught by a full-time faculty member, and that same individual takes on the university supervision function. The other course is taught by an adjunct. The program coordinator visits each participating field experience site to meet with the candidate's principal to assure clear and consistent information on the nature of the field experience and to answer questions about the program and field experience expectations. Such visits were confirmed by the program leadership and school site leadership. Both the school administrator and the CSUSM program coordinator sign the field experience proposal and the end-of-project reflection. These documents and accompanying artifacts are included in the candidates' final electronic portfolios. Interviews with current students indicate strong support for the reflective assignments that are ubiquitous within the program.

The effectiveness of the course of study has been determined through interviews with current students, full-time faculty, and adjunct faculty, as well as program completers. Further support comes from a review of student-generated documents during the visit, in particular, electronic portfolios that were reviewed as evidence.

Connection of Field Experiences with Coursework

The Field Experience Handbook outlines the expectations of the field experience component and the role of the candidate, the site administrator, and the university faculty. In addition, there are forms required of the candidates for the field experience proposal and reflection process. The field experience proposal is based on the content and standards of the course in each semester. Suggestions for projects that support the course standards are posted in the Cougar Course Assignment Portal by course and semester for each of the field studies. Program graduates confirm that some consult the Portal for ideas, while others develop their own projects based on the needs of the work site. This view was also expressed by current students, most of whom prefer to develop their own ideas for field experience projects.

For each unit of instruction, the candidate is required to complete at least 15 hours of field experience work. Projects are also intended for candidates to “use the lens of leadership” in activities such as presenting to faculty, attending district level meetings, leading a committee, shadowing an administrator, serving as an administrator designee, or collecting and interpreting data. An “Action Plan” developed by each candidate specifically targets an area of need at the work site. The candidate analyzes the data, then develops and implements the Action Plan leading to meaningful change at the school. Multiple examples of how such Action Plans have created significant improvements were cited by program graduates, current students, and program faculty. Proposal topics must be approved by the faculty and the pertinent school administrator before the candidate may begin the project. Program faculty cited the need for oversight to assure that all CPSELs are addressed, and that field experience promotes growth among the candidates. Final evaluation of field experience work is conducted through the end-of-program electronic portfolio rubric and faculty feedback.

Assessment of Candidates

Program candidates are assessed and data is collected and analyzed by faculty largely through rubric-based assignments. Candidates are oriented to assessment requirements through cohort meetings, course expectations, field experience orientations, and the program website. Students and program leaders receive timely feedback each semester on rubrics and faculty comments on the data collected. Current candidates confirm that assessment feedback is timely, and that assessment concerns are quickly addressed by faculty. Current candidates, in particular, note the close relationships that the program faculty establishes with them, thereby making assessment an important aspect of the learning that occurs with each assignment. Each course requires a variety of written assignments. Four “signature assignments” of at least 2,500 words are required within the program, each tied to artifacts around a key topic. The signature assignments reflect the program outcomes (CPSELs) as well as the needs of the work sites. This feature of the program is confirmed through interviews with graduates and current students.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Rehabilitative Services Credentials Speech and Language Pathology Services Program

Program Design

According to the program design document prepared by the program chair, prior to 2013, the Department of Speech-Language Pathology (DoSLP) was housed in the School of Education in the College of Education but relocated in 2013 to the Department of Speech-Language

Pathology (DoSLP) in the School of Health Sciences and Human Services within the College of Education, Health and Human Services (CEHHS). The move from the School of Education allowed the DoSLP to develop specific content for certain shared classes, which allowed the program to meet all ASHA (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association) standards in addition to CTC standards. The curriculum was redesigned to meet ASHA and CTC accreditation standards and the first cohort graduates May 2015. The program is ASHA accredited. Prior graduates received their degree through the School of Education. Although the DoSLP is funded through extended education, The College of Education fully supports all operations of the program including admissions, clinical placements and compiling data. The program chair also serves as the program director and reports directly to the Dean of the College of Education.

Interviews with the program chair indicated that the current program consists of 76 units which candidates complete through a full-time course of study over 5 consecutive semesters. Candidates take five foundation courses (14 units); 13 core content courses (34 units); two professional seminars (4 units); two grand rounds (4 units); and four clinical practicum placements (20 units). At least one clinical placement must be in a public school (P-12) setting and all candidates complete 100 hours of in-school practicum. During interviews the program chair, recent graduates, candidates and the clinical supervisor supported the finding that candidates who are interested in careers within the public school system are placed into additional school based practicum. Interviews with recent graduates and candidates spoke to the diversity of placements as being a strength of the program.

The program chair related that there are three full time faculty in addition to the program chair, six part-time faculty members and five clinical supervisors. Faculty and clinical supervisors have a range of expertise. Faculty and adjunct faculty acknowledged during interviews that they were selected for their positions based on their specific expertise and state that they feel valued for their expertise. Graduates and candidates stated they are appreciative of the faculty and frequently seek them out for their unique knowledge. Areas of faculty expertise correspond with both ASHA and CTC program standards. Field based supervisors are employed in a number of districts in the area. Supervisors are asked at the beginning of each year to complete a form that describes their current setting and population. Faculty and the clinic director use that form, together with student interest, to make placements. The clinic director related that she uses spreadsheets to carefully track candidate practicum hours to ensure they meet both ASHA and CTC guidelines. Interviews with candidates and graduates stated that they are confident that the faculty considers their needs as well as their desires when placing them into practicum settings.

Interviews with the program chair and faculty indicate there are weekly faculty meetings where program and institutional operations are shared. Adjunct faculty and supervisors are invited to these meetings. The minutes are posted on a shared web space for faculty and supervisors who cannot attend the weekly meetings. Faculty state that they check the minutes for program updates if they could not attend a meeting.

According to the program chair, site supervisors, faculty, and candidates, the program is highly responsive to feedback, and a number of changes have been made. For example, supervisors stated that candidates came in with theoretical knowledge about assessments, but limited practical knowledge. In response, curricular changes were made and faculty, the program chair and candidates stated that prerequisite coursework in diagnostic methods were added. The program chair and candidates also discussed an added clinical placement in Head Start early in their program to provide additional knowledge of typical language development and second language learning. Supervisors gave feedback to the program about the complexity of an earlier evaluation tool and the evaluation was subsequently modified. Additional curricular changes discussed by the program chair and candidates included a summer writing workshop, and coursework in communication disorders in children with cleft lip and palate. Candidates particularly appreciate the 4-unit series in problem based learning that was added to the curriculum to assist candidates in applying their newly acquired academic knowledge to real life cases.

Candidates and recent graduates stated that their feedback also led to class and program modifications. For example, they believe that feedback directly led to the revision of due dates for assignments and selection of teaching faculty. A common theme among all stakeholder groups was that feedback is solicited, and the program is continually engaged in continuous improvement with feedback from candidates, site supervisors, faculty and adjunct faculty.

Course of Study

The program chair, faculty and candidates relate that the courses in the Communication Sciences and Disorders program are sequenced to give instruction from less intensive (high incidence) to more intensive disorders (low incidence) and from younger populations to older populations. Interviews with recent graduates, candidates, adjunct instructors and site supervisors confirmed that there is a direct correlation between classroom learning and field based assignments. Practicum placements correspond to the course sequence and all students do an early childhood practicum during their first year. Candidates and graduates who express interest in working in the school settings are placed in educational settings as opposed to adult clinics for their first placement which is part time and year long. School based site supervisors confirm that they are assigned first year candidates though they prefer second year candidates as they complete more hours. Candidates' final placement is full time but may or may not be in a public school setting. Of the graduates and candidates interviewed, those who wanted a second a year shared that they had more than one public school placement while in the program. In the schools, there is one on-site supervisor for each candidate.

Review of planning documents and interviews with supervisors indicated that they receive training every fall. According to the institutional faculty, supervisors and program chair, they receive a manual, are introduced to or review policies, paperwork and evaluations. If a supervisor starts midyear, they are paired with an experienced supervisor. The program chair, faculty and supervisors state that there are weekly meetings during the summer and student progress is a standing agenda item. The program chair, faculty and supervisors agree that there is continuous communication about candidate progress toward ASHA and CTC standards and

professional dispositions. Faculty and supervisors shared that they have the support of faculty if there are any concerns about a student's skills, knowledge or dispositions. They further described the procedures that are in place when there is a concern such as writing a statement of concern and developing an action plan. One supervisor related an example in which the supervisor, candidate and clinical director all met to develop a contract that was signed by each of them. This contract is then reviewed weekly along with daily objectives written by the candidate and reviewed by the supervisor.

Candidates described an orientation during which they are instructed on the policies and procedures when there is a concern. They identified the statement of the concern and action plan. According to the program chair, full time faculty members visit each candidate at least once per term while they are in their practicum placement and write a report on their observation. Candidates stated that they appreciated the verbal and written feedback they received from their full time (institutional) faculty. According to the program chair and supervisors, a second purpose for the institutional visit "enables the program to evaluate the suitability of the placement for the level of the candidate, and to ensure that supervision is being provided in accordance with accreditation standards and the candidate's needs".

Supervisors and candidates described the evaluation used midway through the term and at the end of the term as a common rubric to evaluate candidates during the midterms and finals. Supervisors further shared that the rubric was recently revised based on their feedback. Graduates of the program also recalled being evaluated by their supervisor's midway through the term, and again at the end. According to the program chair, faculty and candidates, rubrics are uploaded into Calypso, a shared program used by the university and those evaluations become part of the candidates' professional portfolio.

Candidates stated that they felt well prepared for their field placements, and that their coursework gave them both the knowledge and ability to apply their learning. Graduates supported that they were prepared for their first jobs. They specifically referred to problem based learning as a method that prepared them for their field based placements. Supervisors also stated that they were impressed with the knowledge and skills with which candidates began their practicum. Site supervisors also emphasized the candidates' ability to apply their knowledge to real life situations. Areas that were highlighted by supervisors include assessment of students with a range of disabilities, differentiating a disability from language learning, and developing interventions. Faculty described a collaborative project in which candidates developed and implemented a response to intervention program which they then implemented, and taught to the school based speech pathologist. Candidates spoke admiringly of their faculty, who also serve as their advisors. They also expressed appreciation for courses that they feel allow them to "hit the ground running" in the school based setting such as the Law in Special Education course and the collaboration class. Realia and authentic learning experiences in classes were emphasized by faculty and candidates. Candidates gave examples such as a faculty with expertise in cleft palate brought a client in to the classroom for an assessment, and the candidates were given the opportunity to participate in the assessment.

Another example provided by a faculty was a class during which individuals with autism were invited to class as a guest speaker and to answer questions.

Finally, the program chair, clinical director, site supervisors and candidates describe the institutional supervision visits as a key component of the program. Candidates state that they appreciate the verbal and written feedback they receive. The institutional visit also “enables the program to evaluate the suitability of the placement for the level of the candidate, and to ensure that supervision is being provided in accordance with accreditation standards and the candidate’s needs”.

Candidate Competence

According to the program summary, candidates are assessed in formative and summative ways across academic coursework and clinical practice towards Program Candidate Learning Outcomes, and Standards set out by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). Candidates state that they are oriented to assessment measures as listed in the Candidate Handbook, and on their cohort webpage. Candidates state that they are constantly reminded of assessment due dates, and paperwork deadlines through their cohort websites and in their classes. Candidates who are nearing completion describe a paperwork workshop, during which they are guided by faculty through the completion of the final paperwork for licensure and conferral.

Candidates state they are informed of their final assignments, a portfolio and culminating project at their initial orientation. The Faculty in each class remind candidates about the portfolio throughout the program. The portfolio is built throughout the program and upon program completion is shown to the candidate’s faculty advisor. Graduates, candidates, faculty and the program chair describe the culminating experience which is either a thesis or comprehensive exams. Both have an associated oral defense. Candidates and graduates feel that their coursework prepared them for the comprehensive exams, and that the comprehensive exams prepared them for the Praxis. According to the program chair, there is a 100% pass rate for the Praxis.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.